IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

			: Case No.
		Plaintiff(s)	: Judge Michael R. Barrett
	V.	Defendant(s)	: JOINT DISCOVERY PLAN (RULE 26(f) REPORT) (REQUIRED FORM)
	Now	come all parties to this ca	ase, by and through their respective counsel, and
here	by join	tly submit to the Court this	Joint Discovery Plan, pursuant to the Court's Tria
Proc	edure (Order. The parties conducte	ed their discovery conference on
A.	MAC	SISTRATE CONSENT	
	The	Parties:	
		unanimously consent to t pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §	the jurisdiction of the United States Magistrate Judge 636 (c).
		do not unanimously cons Judge pursuant to 28 U.	ent to the jurisdiction of the United States Magistrate S.C. § 636 (c).
		Magistrate Judge pursua the event that the District	gent consent to the jurisdiction of the United States ant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (c), for trial purposes only, in the trial purposes only, in the date set for the trial settings, civil or criminal).

B.	RUL	E 26(a) DISCLOSURES			
		The parties have exchanged pre-discovery disclosures required by Rule 26(a)(1).			
		The parties will exchange such disclosures by			
		The parties are exempt from disclosures under Rule 26(a)(1)(E).			
	NOT	E: Rule 26(a) disclosures are not to be filed with the Court.			
C.	DISC	OVERY ISSUES AND DATES			
	1.	Discovery will need to be conducted on the issues of			
	2.	The parties recommend that discovery			
		□ need not be bifurcated			
		□ should be bifurcated between liability and damages			
		□ should be bifurcated between factual and expert			
		□ should be limited in some fashion or focused upon particular issues which relate to			
	3.	Disclosure and report of Plaintiff(s) expert(s) by			
	4.	Disclosure and report of Defendant(s) expert(s) by			
	5.	Disclosure and report of rebuttal expert(s) by			
	6.	Disclosure of non-expert (fact) witnesses			
	7.	Discovery cutoff			
	8.	Anticipated discovery problems			
		□ None			

D. <u>LIMITATIONS ON DISCOVERY</u>

	1.	Chan	ges in the limitations on discovery				
			Extension of time limitations (currently one day of seven hours) in taking of depositions to				
			Extension of number of depositions (currently 10) permitted to				
			Extension of number of interrogatories (currently 25) to				
			Other:				
			None				
E.	PRO	TECTI	/E ORDER				
		•	otective order will likely be submitted to the Court on or before				
		partie propo	parties currently do not anticipate the need for a protective order. If the es subsequently deem that one is necessary, they will submit a join used order to the Court. Such order will be in compliance with <i>Procted mble Co. v. Bankers Trust Co.,</i> 78 F. 3d 219 (6th Cir. 1996).				
F.	SET	TLEME	<u>NT</u>				
	A se	ttlemen	t demand has has not been made.				
	A response has has not been made.						
	A demand can be made by						
	A res	sponse	can be made by				
G.	MOTION DEADLINES						
	1.	Motio	on to amend the pleadings and/or add parties by				
	2.	Motio	ons relative to the pleadings by				
	3.	Dispo	ositive motions by				

OTHE	ER MATTERS PERTINENT T	O MANAGEMENT OF THIS LI
gnatures:	Attorney for Plaintiff(s)	Attorney for Defendant(s)
	Attorney for	Attorney for Defendant(s)
	Attorney for	Attorney for